

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 and 18-30 were presented for examination and are pending in this application. In a Final Office Action dated November 12, 2004, claims 1-16 and 17-30 were rejected.

### **Telephonic Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 7, 2005, during which agreement was reached concerning amendments to patentably distinguish the independent claims over the documents relied on by the Examiner. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the discussion at the interview.

Applicants further have amended claim 30 to correct the antecedent basis issue identified by the Examiner in the Office Action.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 1**

These rejections are moot in light of applicants' proposed amendments. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 2**

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 30 as not specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 30 to change "the" to "a" in claim 30.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**

In the 10th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 9, 16, 18-21, and 25-29 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker et al., U.S. Patent 5,862,223 ("Walker '223") in view of Salas et al, U.S. Patent 6,233,600 ("Salas"); in the 11th

paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 6-8 in further view of Rackson et al., U.S. Patent 6,415,270 (Rackson); in the 12th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 10-11 in further view of Glasser et al., U.S. Patent 5,956,715 (Glasser). In the 13th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12-15 as being unpatentable over Walker in further view of Bi et al., U.S. Patent 6,311,178 (Bi); in the 14<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action claims 22-23 as being unpatentable over Walker '223 in further view of Bi, and in further view of Walker et al. 6,484,153 (Walker '153). In the 15<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 24 as being unpatentable over Walker '223 in further view of Salas and in further view of Murcho, Jr., U.S. Patent 6,578,014 (Murcho, Jr.). In the 16<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 30 as being unpatentable over Walker '223 in further view of Bi and in further view of Salas. These rejections are moot in light of the claim amendments agreed on at the interview.

#### **Independent Claims 1, 12,16, 18-21 and their Dependent Claims**

The amendments to each of independent claims 1, 12, 16, and 18-21 and their dependent claims were agreed to patentably distinguish the pending claims over the cited art. The pending claims should be allowed for at least this reason.


#### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 and 18-30, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied).

Therefore, Applicants request entry of the amendments and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,  
BEERUD D. SHETH AND SRINIVAS  
ANUMOLU

Date: May 12, 2005

By:   
Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7152  
Fax: (650) 938-5200